

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 7, 2006 has been reviewed, and the following remarks are made in response thereto. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims. Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are pending. Claims 1 and 42 have been amended. Written support for the claim amendments is found throughout the specification and in the original claims, thus Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

Summary of the final Office Action

1. Claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite because the abbreviations used in claims 1 and 42 are subject to more than one interpretation.
2. Claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) as being unclear because it is uncertain if “GST” as used in claims 1 and 42 refers to a whole protein or a domain of a protein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite because the abbreviated terms, in claims 1 and 42 are allegedly subject to more than one interpretation.

The Examiner alleges on page four (4) of the office action that the abbreviated terms, “GST, SH1, PH, PTB and LIM,” in claims 1 and 42 may be subject to more than one interpretation. For example, the Examiner contends that the abbreviated term “GST” could indicate glutathione S-transferase or genomic sequence tag. Claim 1 reads in part, “a domain of interest selected from the group consisting of GST, SH1, PH, PTB, LIM.” Applicants respectfully point out that the abbreviated terms “GST, SH1, PH, PTB and LIM” as used in combination with the preceding term “domain” would be well known and clearly defined to one of skill in the art.

However, without acquiescing to the merits of the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to clearly indicate the full-name for each abbreviated term. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 42 to specify that the term “GST” refers to Glutathione S-transferase, the term “SH1” refers to Src homology 1, the term “PH” refers to Pleckstrin homology and the term “PTB” refers to Phosphotyrosine binding. Additionally, Applicants have amended the specification to include the full-

name for each abbreviated term in order to provide clear antecedent basis for the full-names used in the amended claims. While an Applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed, he or she should make appropriate amendment of the specification whenever this nomenclature is departed from by amendment of the claims so as to have clear support or antecedent basis in the specification for the new terms appearing in the claims (see MPEP 608.01(0)). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants have amended the Specification to clearly indicate that the term "LIM" derives its abbreviation from the first letter of the three genes in which it was first discovered, the Lin-11, Isl-1 and Mec-3 genes. Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of the foregoing to the Specification does not constitute new matter as one of skill in the art at the time of the present invention would categorically recognize that the abbreviated term "LIM" preceded by the term "domain" refers to the domain present in the Lin-11, Isl-1 and Mec-3 gene products. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being unclear because "GST" as used in claims 1 and 42 may allegedly refer to either a whole protein or a domain of a protein.

Without acquiescing to the merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 and 42 to specify that the claims are directed to a catalytic subunit of GST. Support for this amendment is located on page 32, lines 14-24 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

The foregoing amendments and remarks are being made to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. A favorable action is awaited. Should the Examiner find that an interview would be helpful to further prosecution of this application, they are invited to telephone the undersigned at their convenience.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Dated: **May 31, 2006**
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Customer No. **09629**
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000

Respectfully submitted
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Christopher J. Betti
Christopher J. Betti
Registration No. 56,890